



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

lar books in English literature to foreign sources, and by a comprehensive course of study, arranged according to Collins' idea of what an ideal course would be. In the doctrine and structure of the book the influence of Jowett is to me quite patent. Collins had evidently written to Jowett for advice as to the conduct of his campaign, and the following is the reply :

November 29, 1886.

We have had a meeting of our Committee of Council about the final School of Modern Language and Literature. I am not at liberty to tell you the precise conclusions at which we arrived until they have been voted upon by Council. But I think that we shall probably maintain the claims of literature to be equal with those of language; and the inseparability of ancient and modern literature.

I think that of the plans which you mention by far the best is the article in the *Quarterly*, which will be in plenty of time to influence the question if it appears in the January number. . . .

Your article might touch (1) on the importance to the study of Classical Literature of its association with modern, because that gives a new interest to it. It is getting in some respects worn out, and that would breathe a new life into it. (2) On the necessity of the knowledge of the classics for the intelligent study of modern literature—far greater clearly than the study of the early stages of English literature, even of Chaucer, with that view.¹

The University was compelled to yield to the popular demand for the inclusion of English in its curriculum, and established the new Merton chair of English Language and Literature. There was a considerable struggle over the incumbent; but A. S. Napier was finally elected. This meant defeat to Collins, for Mr. Napier is a philologist, and the controversy was by no means over. Collins continued his writing and probably the best summary of the whole matter is to be found in the first essay on *English Literature at the Universities* in *Ephemeræ Critica*, which consists of censure of the English course to be followed at Oxford and a critical examination of its provisions.

Any sound judgment of Collins' strictures on the regulations for the Honor School in Literature should, naturally, be based on a study of the actual requirements of the school. Perhaps the most tangible test of those requirements is to be found in the papers set for the examination of candidates for degrees. I find that incidental

provision is made for most of the subjects demanded by Collins; but that, as he says, instruction in the classics and in the theory of criticism is omitted. To leave the comparative study of English elective is, in Collins' view, to omit it.

In conclusion, I should say that, as a critic, Collins stands for two things, the first of which is the possession of convictions and principles relating to the judgment of literature, coupled with free and forcible expression of the same. Except perhaps in the case of living writers, he never ventures an opinion off-hand; his decisions are backed by wide and reflective reading. He impresses me not as a critic by inspiration, but one by training.

Secondly, Collins stands for the continuity of literature. Homer is as much our heritage as he was the early possession of the contemporaries of Pisistratus. But literature, to Collins, has an esoteric significance; it means the critical tradition from Plato and Aristotle down to our own day. As the latest product of this tradition, the modern critic is to understand and speak "the best that has been known and thought in the world," freely, sincerely, and as a duty.

ALLEN R. BENHAM.

The University of Washington.

CONCERNING THE TELL SOLILOQUY.

In his article entitled *Zu Tells Monolog* (*Modern Language Notes*, November, 1908) Prof. Charles H. Handschin points out what he considers to be a series of related resemblances between the monologue situation in Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell* (act 4, scene 3) and that of Wallrad von Sponheim, in Maler Müller's *Golo und Genoveva* (act 2, scene 5). After carefully reading Handschin's presentation of his case, I feel compelled to take issue with him. It seems to me that the relations existing between Schiller's *Tell* and the older 'Tell' stories should, from the nature of the case, take precedence over such necessarily problematical parallelisms as Handschin points out. This is all the more true in the present case, since, as Handschin himself admits,

¹ See Abbott and Campbell, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 314.

Schiller probably never read Müller's *Golo und Genoveva*.

First of all, as to the mere occurrence of a monologue in both Müller and Schiller—a coincidence which Handschin seizes upon for his purpose. A monologue, in some cases partaking somewhat of the nature of a prayer, occurs also in several older 'Tell' dramas, notably in Jakob Ruef's *Ein hüpsch und lustig Spyl . . . von dem . . . Wilhelm Thellen* (Zürich, 1545) as found in 'Schweizerische Schauspiele des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts. Bearbeitet . . . unter Leitung von Jakob Bächtold' (Zürich, 1893, pp. 103-4). This drama, I might say in passing, was itself based on the old 'Urner Spiel' *Ein hüpsch Spyl gehalten zuo Vry in der Eydgnoschaft, von dem frommen vnd ersten Eydgnossen, Wilhelm Thell* etc. (Zürich). It seems practically certain that Schiller saw a copy of the 'Urner Spiel' in the Weimar library. Moreover, Ruef's version, according to Gustav Roethe, was listed in vol. 5 of Haller's 'Bibliothek der Schweizergeschichte'—a book which Schiller is known to have consulted. Though the parallelisms between Schiller's *Tell* and these two older 'Tell' dramas are many, and some of them are, indeed, most striking, still this is not the place to cite them in detail. Perhaps I ought to add at this point that there are also noteworthy resemblances between Schiller's work and some of the other earlier versions of 'Tell'; I shall have occasion later to refer to some of these versions. For a list of works dealing with the 'Tell' problem in its various phases, Franz Heinemann's admirable 'Tell-Bibliographie' (Bern, 1907) may be consulted to advantage.

But Handschin finds also a significant parallelism between Schiller's passage 'Ich laure auf ein edles Wild' and a similar one in *Golo und Genoveva*. Now, Tell is a hunter. We know him as 'Tell der Schütz.' Having reached the 'hohle Gasse' to await there the arrival of his victim, his soliloquy naturally turns to such expressions as ' . . . liebe Kinder, . . . Jetzt geht er [der Vater] einem andern Weidwerk nach' . . . 'Des Feindes Leben ist's, worauf er lauert' . . . 'Ich laure auf ein edles Wild.' But if we must needs find a precedent for Schiller, why seek it in so unlikely a source as *Golo und Genoveva*, when we have ready at hand Bodmer's *Wilhelm Tell* (1775) in

which we read, p. 6: 'Hier im Gesträuche (cf. 'Holunderstrauch' in Schiller) warte ich auf das Raubthier?' Moreover,—and this is an important point, of course—we have sufficient evidence at hand to render it highly probable that Schiller was acquainted with this 'Tell' drama of Bodmer.

Handschin furthermore claims that Wallrad in his soliloquy apostrophizes his heart, ear, and eye "ganz in der Art," in Handschin's words, "wie Tell Pfeil und Bogensehne anredet." This 'parallelism' between heart, ear, and eye in Müller, and arrow and bow-string in Schiller is scarcely convincing, it seems to me, when we have actually an apostrophized *arrow* (!) and *bow-string* (!) in the soliloquy (!) of the anonymous 'Tell' drama *Der Schweizerbund* (act 4, scene 4). Cf. Gustav Roethe's article: *Die dramatischen Quellen des Schillerschen 'Tell'* in *Forschungen zur deutschen Philologie* (Leipzig, 1894, p. 257). This drama, *Der Schweizerbund*, is now, by some half dozen scholars, assigned to Johann Ludwig Ambühl (am Bühel). It is not unlikely that Schiller was acquainted with it; indeed, just as, in his play, he has perpetuated the name of the historian Johannes Müller (l. 2948), so he has also named one of his characters Burkhart *am Bühel*. On this last point cf. J. Keller in Kehr's *Pädagogische Blätter*, No. 15, pp. 149 ff. (1886). Ambühl's Tell plucks at his *bow-string* in order to test its strength and soliloquizes: 'Gut. Und du! (as he examines his *arrow*) auch gut. . . Wohl es muss seyn, Tyrann! Wenn dir noch ein Heiliger im Himmel wohl will, so ahndets dir! . . .' It seems to me quite impossible to deny the suggestive parallelism here with Schiller's:

'Mach deine Rechnung mit dem Himmel, Vogt! . . .
Komm du hervor, du Bringer bitterer Schmerzen,
Mein teures Kleinod jetzt, mein höchster Schatz . . .
 Und du,
Vertraute Bogensehne, die so oft
Mir treu gedient hat in der Freude Spielen,

Nur jetzt noch halte fest, du treuer Strang,
Der mir so oft den herben Pfeil beflügelt . . .'

But Handschin finds also in the soliloquy of *Tell* and that of *Golo und Genoveva* a parallel reference to suffering innocence. Suffering innocence, however, and a consequent conviction that the country must be rid of the offenders

are among the very motives of the older 'Tell' plays. Cf., for instance, Ruef's version already referred to above.

Finally as to the music introduced in Schiller's monologue situation—a feature which Handschin also traces to Müller's influence. On October 1, 1803, Schiller saw *Julius Cæsar* played in Weimar, and on the following day wrote to Goethe: 'Für meinen Tell ist mir das Stück von unschätzbarem Wert; mein Schifflein wird auch dadurch gehoben. Er [Julius Cæsar] hat mich gleich gestern in die tätigste Stimmung gesetzt.' *Julius Cæsar*, as well as others of Shakespeare's plays, of course had its influence on Schiller's *Tell*, but, although some of the Shakespearean touches in Schiller's play are very readily recognized, others, again, are more or less conjectural. Still, if we must here again find a precedent for Schiller, I would suggest that perhaps the musical feature in *Tell* is, in part at least, to be regarded as a Shakespearean echo.

At any rate, in *Julius Cæsar* we have music artistically introduced just before the portentous ghost scene, while in *Tell* we have music most effectively introduced just before the tragic shooting scene. Why, then, not connect these two strikingly parallel features? Such a step, indeed, would be much more justified, under the circumstances, than an attempt to involve so problematical a model as *Golo und Genoveva*—a drama which, as I conclude from Handschin's article, Schiller probably never read and probably never saw performed on the stage.

C. H. IBERSHOFF.

Harvard University.

BROWNING'S EPILOGUE TO THE TWO POETS OF CROISIC.

Commentators of Browning have paid but scanty attention to the charming Epilogue to the *Two Poets of Croisic*, beginning:

"What a pretty tale you told me
Once upon a time
Said you found it somewhere (scold me!)
Was it prose or was it rhyme,
Greek or Latin? Greek, you said,
While your shoulder propped my head."

And yet the poem possesses interest, if for no other reason, in that it affords a signal illustration of the foreign debt of English literature. In this note I wish to indicate that debt by quoting a few parallels from the literature of ancient Greece and by drawing from them a conclusion which I wish to be regarded as suggestive rather than definitive.

The poem was written January 15, 1878.¹ Mrs. Orr, to whom it was dedicated, substantially denies the Greek element in the poem. "The 'Tale' with which it (*i. e.*, *The Two Poets of Croisic*) concludes is inspired by the same feeling (*i. e.*, as is *Natural Magic*). Its circumstance is ancient, and the reader is allowed to imagine that it exists in Latin or Greek; but it is simply a poetic and profound illustration of what love can do always and everywhere."² Neither Professor Lawton in his interesting paper on *The Classical Element in Browning's Poetry*³ nor Miss Scudder, *The Greek Spirit in Shelley and Browning*,⁴ alludes to the Epilogue, and it finds no place among the poems cited as coming from Classical sources in *Robert Browning's Poetry, Outline Studies*.⁵ The entire story of the cicada and the lyre-player is nevertheless purely Greek, as the poet himself clearly indicates in the opening lines. The story appears in both verse and prose. Several of the references have been cited by Mr. Mackail in a note on an epigram in the Palatine Anthology in his first edition of *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*.⁶ These were repeated without addition by Mr. Cooke in his *Guide Book*.⁷ The note in the 1896 edition of Browning's poems by Charlotte Porter and Helen A. Clarke, the editors of *Poet Lore*, is based upon the comments of Mr. Cooke and of Mrs. Orr. It is incorrect in saying

¹ *Poetic and Dramatic Works of R. Browning*, vol. VI, p. 116; G. W. Cooke, *A Guide Book to the Poetic and Dramatic Works of Browning*, Boston, 1891, p. 424; *Browning Society Papers*, 1881-1884, Part I, Chronological List of B.'s Works, p. 69.

² *Handbook to Works of Robert Browning*, London, 1885, pp. 217, 218.

³ *Boston Browning Papers*, New York, 1897, pp. 363-387.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 438-470.

⁵ Chicago, 1886, p. 24.

⁶ Longmans, Green, and Co., London, 1890: Epigram 6. 54. This edition is now out of print. The epigram is omitted from the second edition, London, 1906.

⁷ G. W. Cooke, pp. 446, 447.